



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/639,508	08/16/2000	Richard S. Chomik	460,1891USV	3194
7590	08/16/2012	Charles N.J. Ruggiero Esq OHLANDT GREELEY RUGGIERO & PERLE LLP One Landmark Square Stamford, CT 06901-2682	EXAMINER DEXTER, CLARK F	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		3724	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		08/16/2012	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/639,508	Applicant(s) CHOMIK ET AL.
	Examiner CLARK F. DEXTER	Art Unit 3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2011.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

5) Claim(s) 15,16,25-29,41 and 42 is/are pending in the application.

5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

7) Claim(s) 15,16,25-29,41 and 42 is/are rejected.

8) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

9) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

11) The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2009 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-152)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/8/12

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on December 12, 2011 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed on June 8, 2012 has been received and the reference listed thereon has been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 15, 16, 25, 26 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenwood et al., pn 5,499,729.

Greenwood discloses the claimed method (except for the limitations shown in italics and grayed-out) as follows:

a method of forming a plurality of perforations (e.g., 73, 74) in a concavely curved domed portion (e.g., 77) of a vent disc (e.g., 72), which comprises:

forming a plurality of upwardly extending depressions (e.g., 74) in an undersurface of said domed portion while leaving a residual (e.g., the portion through which 73 extends; see Fig. 17) of said domed portion above each of said depressions, said depressions each having a centerline, each of said centerlines of said depressions being coincident with a radius that forms a concave curvature of said domed portion; and

forming a slit (e.g., see col. 2, lines 25-29; and see claim 7, particularly in combination with claim 1 from which claim 7 depends, wherein claim 1 sets forth such a combination in the line bridging columns 10-11 when included with the subject matter of claim 7) through each said residual, said slits being resealable and each having a centerline, each of said centerlines of said slits being formed coincident to a corresponding one of said centerlines of said depressions, wherein said slits that have a width of about 0.040 to about 0.080 inches, said domed portion being elastomeric,

said domed portion having 35 to 60 of said slits, said slits being in a pattern on said domed portion having a series of radial extensions (e.g., in Fig. 15, the portions of the pattern which form an "X" and a "+" can be considered to form 4 radial extensions

combined), each of said series of radial extensions having an equal number of said slits (e.g., 3 slits);

[claim 15] The method of claim 41, further comprising forming each of said depressions as hemispherical in shape (e.g., see Fig. 17).

Greenwood lacks the specific slit width (i.e., what is typically considered to be the "slit length") as follows:

[from claim 16] wherein said slits that have a width of about 0.040 to about 0.080 inches;

[claim 25] wherein said slits have a width of about 0.058 to about 0.062 inch;

[claim 26 (from 25)] wherein said slits have a width about 0.060 inch.

However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide slits having such a width because to provide such a width would be the mere discovery of the optimum or workable ranges within the general conditions of the prior art by one having ordinary skill in the art. Additionally, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the disclosed invention of Greenwood to such a scale, based on a particular need, such that such a width criteria is met by the invention disclosed by Greenwood.

Greenwood further lacks the specific number of slits as follows:

[from claim 16] said domed portion having 35 to 60 of said slits.

However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a particular number of slits including additional slits as necessary to provide the desired diaphragm (e.g., air flow and size) characteristics. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the specific number of slits on the diaphragm of Greenwood to gain the well known benefits including that described above.

Regarding claims 41 and 42, **Greenwood further lacks:**

[claim 41] wherein said radial extensions are 12 radial extensions equally circumferentially angularly spaced 30 degrees from each other, each of said radial extensions having four of said equally radially spaced individual slits;

[claim 42] wherein said radial extensions are 12 radial extensions.

However, the Examiner takes Official notice that providing the perforations (which includes the slits) in such a pattern is merely one of a myriad of such known patterns and it is respectfully submitted that providing such a pattern amounts to a mere matter of design choice to one having ordinary skill in the art and thus obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CLARK F. DEXTER whose telephone number is (571)272-4505. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer D. Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**/CLARK F DEXTER/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724**

cfd
August 13, 2012